



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

THE CHURCH COLLEGES SPEAK OUT

The effectiveness of the church or denominational colleges in their relation to the churches has been called into serious question. Specifically, the points at issue are these:

(1) *Does the "church college" need to be "redeemed"?*

If so, as one of our inquiring friends asks, from what, by whom, and to what? The answers of a few of the college presidents seem to indicate that in their judgment the "church college" should be redeemed from the blighting effects of the theory of evolution!

(2) *Do the denominational colleges need to be "turned back to the service of the church?"*

The question is asked, of course, on the assumption that the church college has at some time in the past abandoned the service of the church.

(3) *Is it true that the church colleges are "practically dominated by the interests that control the public school system."*

(4) *If it be true that in a limited area concerning which the facts are known "the church colleges do thirteen times as much for the training of public school teachers as they do for the training of religious teachers," are the church colleges entirely responsible for the situation? Is there operative here any law of supply and demand?*

(5) *Is it true that "the church colleges have failed to recognize that they have a distinct contribution to make to the church?" Or is it true that having recognized this fact they frankly admit their partial failure to realize their ideal?*

(6) *Is it true that the present "social unrest" exists "because the denominational colleges have not recognized that their contribution was to give to the leaders of this country through their sociology departments the social program of Jesus Christ?" Does American "social unrest" have so simple a cause as this?*

(7) *Is it true that the "social service departments in denominational Boards have been created" because of this same failure on the part of the colleges?*

(8) *Is it true that "denominational colleges have failed as teachers of Biblical history and literature, and the nature and structure of religion?"* This question bears upon the standardization work of the Committee on Biblical Departments of the Religious Education Association.

(9) *Is it true that "the most lamentable failures of the denominational colleges have been in the departments of philosophy and ethics and in their departments of sociology?"*

(10) *Is it true that the church colleges alone will ever be able to solve the problem of social unrest and of church leadership?*

(11) *And finally, what agency is there which is powerful enough "to put the church college out of business?"*

Assuming that it may be desirable to do so, how would you go about putting out of business a small church college with 455 students which during its history has had 9,000 young men in attendance, of whom more than 1,800 have been ordained ministers of the gospel, 42 have been moderators of the Presbyterian General Assembly, 91 have been presidents of colleges and universities, approximately 2,000 have been engineers, teachers, chemists, and business men, more than 700 physicians, more than 1,300 lawyers, 21 judges of State Supreme Courts, nearly 300 State legislators, 91 U. S. congressmen, 10 governors of States, 11 U. S. Senators, and 4 cabinet members?

PERILS IN CRITICISM

1. Constructive criticism is always wholesome and valuable and it must be admitted by all concerned that not all of the truth can be seen from one point of view. Presumably college presidents are able to tell what the policy and program of their institution is. It must be left largely to others to evaluate this policy and program and to indicate the degree to which it has been successfully carried out.

2. The tendency to unqualified generalization is said to be in a very distinctive sense an American trait. There certainly must be types of church or denominational colleges which represent all

degrees of educational effectiveness. It is scarcely likely that any sweeping criticism will be equally applicable, or indeed applicable at all in all cases. The judicial attitude of mind requires careful discrimination.

3. There is a constant danger in an attempt to professionalize religion or religious teaching and to judge it in terms of the response to certain specific and professional demands. Liberal arts colleges of America—and most denominational colleges are colleges of liberal arts—have held pretty definitely to a non-professional program. Their policy has been to turn over to other institutions the processes of technical training. They would weigh carefully all propositions to introduce strictly technical departments.

4. There is a danger on the other side to be avoided in concluding that an institution has been Christianized because its professors have good characters and good intentions. It is generally recognized that the newer curriculum subjects have not yet been scientifically elaborated, much less have they been permeated with distinctively Christian teaching by highly competent scholars. The question both of the teacher and the text-book, therefore, must be taken into consideration.

But our topic says, "The Church Colleges Speak Out" and we must give them an opportunity to do so.

At the Quadrennial International Sunday School Convention in Kansas City last summer, Dr. Walter S. Athearn made an address on "The Outlook for Christian Education."* It was clear that the subject was one in which the Sunday School workers and their friends gathered on that occasion were keenly interested and that they were in hearty sympathy with the views of the speaker, particularly when he made an arraignment of the church colleges. The Committee on Education of the International Council, we are told, is continuing the work of gathering facts preparatory to publishing soon an exhaustive report on the whole subject.

* Copies of the complete address may be secured without charge from the School of Religious Education and Social Service, Boston University, Boston, Mass.

Dr. Athearn spoke plainly. He did not confine himself to an exposition of Sunday School problems—evidently not yet all solved. He made it clear that in his opinion the church college had not measured up to its opportunity, and that it was distinctly blameworthy insofar as it had failed in this respect. Believing that colleges like men are imperfect, have not yet “attained,” and may profit by serious criticism, and in order to call this matter to the attention of the college presidents, to give them a chance to be heard in their own defense, and to enlighten the general public, the Council of Church Boards of Education sent the following multi-graphed letter in early September to about five hundred denominational and independent colleges.

September 8, 1922.

Dear Mr. President:

In his address at the Kansas City Sunday School Convention on “The Outlook for Christian Education,” Dr. Walter S. Athearn said:

“The next step is to redeem the church college. . . . Our church colleges have failed to recognize that they have a distinct contribution to make to the church. The department of philosophy in a Christian college should give to all students a philosophical interpretation of the ideals of the Christian religion, so that whatever philosophies may evolve out of the sciences taught in that college, they will all be seen in the light of the philosophy of Christianity. . . . Denominational colleges have failed as teachers of Biblical history and literature, and the nature and structure of religion, but their most lamentable failures have been in their departments of philosophy and ethics, and their departments of sociology.”

Will you be good enough to tell me how much truth you think there is in Dr. Athearn’s assertions? *Will you answer with special reference to your own institution?*

Will you kindly send me a list of the text and reference books used by your Professors in Bible, Philosophy, Ethics, Sociology, and Political Science, *which have been found useful in the constructive presentation of the Christian point of view?*

Sincerely,

ROBERT L. KELLY.

In the October number of CHRISTIAN EDUCATION the Editor made reference to this inquiry and the many interesting and diverse comments it had provoked, and quoting a yet stronger paragraph from the Kansas City address, promised to make a full presentation of the subject in a succeeding issue. The additional paragraph was this:

“When the departments of these colleges come back to their task we shall have a leadership that will solve these great problems, and we will not be battling to give the church a social program or to square the findings of science with the claims of religion. The church college will solve this problem. Now, let us call the church colleges back to that task, or put them out of business!”

On the whole, the response of the colleges has been gratifying. Included among the five hundred to whom the letter was sent were many Roman Catholic institutions, many of which did not reply. These were appealed to, not because they were included in the criticism, but that they might be given an opportunity to express themselves. Some technical and vocational training schools and a few municipal institutions were on the list. Replies were received from 134 institutions. Of these, twelve merely sent lists of books, without comment, Dr. Athearn's institution being one. Nine Catholic colleges responded, indicating in a definite and positive way what they are trying to do. They were at considerable pains to prepare lists of Catholic texts which had been found most useful.

The very fact that 25% of the colleges of the country replied to such a form letter sent out during the period of matriculation is in itself encouraging evidence of the vitality of the subject under discussion. Perhaps it substantiates the view expressed by one correspondent that if failure there were on the part of the college, it was not “to recognize” but adequately to fulfill its responsibility of rendering a unique contribution to the church—an indictment no less severe, but of different quality and possibly indicative of a condition attended by certain extenuating circumstances. There are colleges and colleges, of course, but very few are indifferent to the voice of public opinion, even a small section of public opinion.

Of the 125 Protestant colleges replying, five are located in the New England States, sixteen in the Middle States and Maryland (including the District of Columbia), sixty are in the territory covered by the North Central Association, thirty-four are in the territory of the Southern Association, and ten are in the Far West.

Three Colleges Plead Guilty

Three colleges acknowledge the criticism as just and applicable to themselves without qualification. One of these is a college for colored youth. One president writes:

"I think Dr. Athearn's assertions are perfectly true. They are true as regards ————— (his own institution)."

Another says:

"I do not know what Dr. Athearn had in mind in the paragraph which you quote from him, but I agree with him entirely as to the failure of the colleges in regard to biblical history, literature, moral and spiritual attitude. I believe that much teaching is today not only a failure to do what needs to be done but an assault on the essentials of Christian faith."

The third man, dean of his college, fairly shouts his approval:

"Your encyclical of the 8th inst. had my range and landed directly in my trench. Dr. Athearn's remark is appropos. Instead of regaling you with a list of my inferior reference books, I am writing to ask you to be good enough to send me a list."

Eighty Colleges Deny the Charges

Eighty colleges made denial of the charges; of this number, fifteen indignantly repudiate them as absolutely unfounded. The following letters are typical:

"I don't believe that the church colleges have failed to recognize that they have a distinct contribution to make to the church. On the contrary, I believe that the average church college has felt a very distinct responsibility to the church in the matter of teaching Christian ideals as well as giving scientific and philosophical instruction."

"Let me say that the church schools with which I am acquainted do not need redemption. They do recognize their responsibility and are giving back thousands to the service of the churches."

"The statement is entirely too sweeping. I do not believe the Christian College has failed either as teacher of Biblical History, Literature, etc., or as teacher of Philosophy, Ethics and Sociology. . . . We are beginning to realize that character is of most value and is dependent upon something more than the development of the brains. Men are slowly awakening to the conviction that the problems of society and religion, education, politics and government, industry and commerce are affected by the view which men have of their relation to God as well as their relation to man. I think the outlook is full of great hope."

"Referring to the pessimistic statements of Mr. Walter S. Athearn, I write to say that I do not believe that denominational colleges have made such lamentable failures either in the departments of religion, or of philosophy and ethics. Our institution is not under the control of any single denomination. It is, however, in its history, its ideals, and its teaching force, what would be called an interdenominational, strictly Christian institution. In selecting new professors, one of the first inquiries is concerning his Christian character and attitude."

"My own experience of more than twenty-five years in connection with denominational schools affords ground for the opinion that they have been and are contributing immeasurably, where Dr. Athearn declares they have failed. Much of this contribution is made through the influence of distinctively Christian teaching rather than through specific courses in biblical and religious subjects. If Dr. Athearn means that the denominational schools, single-handed, have not stayed the avalanche of scientific and diabolical materialism, civic and commercial greed, with all their train of evils, obviously he is right. If he means the church and schools, generally speaking, have not sincerely done their best to carry out the principles and ideals of the Christian religion as applied to education, he is, in my judgment, wrong."

"I am quite convinced that such sweeping criticisms as that given by Dr. Athearn are unfair and untrue. We believe, at least here at ———, that we are in deed and in truth a Christian college with equal emphasis upon the Christian and the college."

"I have consulted the members of our faculty who have had experience both as students and teachers in denominational col-

leges, and I find that with a single exception we are unanimous in saying that the statement by Dr. Athearn does not apply to conditions with which we have had experience. The denominational institutions represented by those consulted are _____ (eleven institutions named)."

Two colleges, though they took the trouble to reply to the circular letter, say they feel little concern:

"There may be here and there colleges that have failed in some of the particulars he mentions. I think, however, it would be difficult to find many examples. We get, at _____, the usual number of criticisms along these lines. We are not very much disturbed by them."

"If preachers would spend less time in denouncing their own institutions—the church and the school—they would probably have more time for saving a lost world in a most practical manner. The statements that are made usually at these larger gatherings are for the purpose of sensation. I do not believe that we need worry about Dr. Athearn's statement."

The president of a Congregational college of long and honorable history writes candidly:

"No one would be rash enough to say that the Christian colleges have lived up fully to their opportunity in the departments of Biblical History, and Literature, and the nature and structure of Religion, Philosophy, Ethics and Sociology. But in my judgment his condemnation is far too sweeping. The failure has been in part due to the inability of the college to reach its ideals in any of its work. Under the old system of required courses for all students we could bring influences which we desired to have most compelling to bear upon each member of the student body. The present distribution of students into smaller groups makes such unity of influence impossible. But I do not agree that the Christian colleges have lamentably failed in the fields to which he refers. In the field of Philosophy and Ethics and also in Sociology _____ college has strong teachers with marked Christian influence and I do not believe for a moment that their work in developing the Christian attitude and emphasizing Christian ideals could be called a lamentable failure."

Several presidents admit that conditions as described were prev-

alent some years ago but are confident they are rarely to be found today:

"I write to say that up to about four years ago, I believe that his criticism of the average church college, as I know them, is in the main, just, though his criticism does not make sufficient allowance for the indefinite, yet strong, influence of the spirit of the institutions. My observation leads me to say that the church colleges are undergoing a transformation in the matter of accepting their responsibility for a specific, thorough-going training in Christian standards and ideals."

"Dr. Althearn is making a sweeping assertion, but I presume one should not question his veracity. Personally, his statement if made ten years ago would have held good, so far as our work is concerned, but it certainly does not apply to us at present."

"I believe that the church college has been redeemed. If there was a time in the recent past when church colleges seemed to recognize a stronger obligation to the state than to the church in shaping their curricula, that day is rapidly passing. Probably every church school which recognizes any obligation to give vocational courses for the sake of providing teachers for the state will recognize an equal obligation to provide training for Christian leadership in the home community."

A fourth, expressing the same idea, modestly claims as fairly due some recognition of "improvement" even though the ideal is not yet fully realized:

"I think Dr. Althearn is a little late in his judgment. Possibly our colleges did not fully recognize their obligation to make a distinct contribution to their church several years ago. Now, however, they are attempting to do this very thing. So I feel that at least the credit for improvement in this line is due along with the criticism referred to."

Thirty-nine colleges not presuming to speak for others, make no reply as to the truth of the general criticism but boldly challenge the statement as "unjust and misleading" when applied to themselves. Of such replies the following are typical:

"Replying to your letter of September 8th referring to the address of Dr. Althearn, I take the opportunity of saying that no

line of the paragraph you quote is a fair representation either of the ideals or real condition of this institution."

"Thank you for giving us a chance to give testimony with regard to the charge of Dr. Athearn. ——— college has for many years made a very definite endeavor to make a distinct contribution to the church. We have recognized that the college owes its existence to the church and that its only justification is that it really sends its students back from the college to the homes and churches and communities from which they came definitely prepared to be leaders in every movement for the advancement of the church and society. I think our record will show that we have been making good and that our women are taking their places as leaders in every good work."

"You ask my opinion as to the truthfulness of this statement as regards ———. I think it is not true at all. The college has recognized its obligations to the church and has performed its duties as faithfully as any institution of which I have knowledge. Of course, all of us who do any kind of work for our fellow-man feel, after its performance, that we wish we might have done it better and more effectively. We, of course, see wherein we have made mistakes and if we could do it over in the light of that experience we might improve. It is in the latter sense only that I would say that his statement has any application whatever to ——— college."

"How far it may be applied to most of the denominational colleges I do not know, but I am convinced that it is very wide of the mark so far as ——— college is concerned."

"My judgment is that Brother Athearn carries the theory of emphasis by exaggeration up to about the *n*th power. I am enclosing some facts regarding ——— which have a bearing upon the quotation of your recent letter."

"Not a bit of truth in it as applied to ———. Dr. ——— is the prince of all Bible teachers, sound to the core, and thorough to a fault, if that is possible. I teach sociology and ethics and know that they are made Christian."

"This is the first time that my attention has been called to that address. I am a little surprised, and I honestly believe with reference to our own institution that the sentiment of the address is

not true. We are doing our best to keep the atmosphere in this institution truly Christian. Always the emphasis is placed on education as a means of service. We insist that education in this institution must be controlled by a Christian motive and we are employing every possible agency to make the ideals of the campus what they ought to be."

Two men speak not only of the institutions with which they are connected but with equal confidence for those of their denomination:

"I really cannot say how much truth there may be in Dr. Athearn's statement regarding the church college. I have been for a long time convinced of the difficulty which faces the presidents of Christian colleges to secure philosophical teaching which should be true to the ideals of the Christian religion. In this institution we have made a virtue of our weakness in this respect and teach theistic philosophy without equivocation or excuse. *I am sure that this is done in most of our Methodist institutions because of the influence of Borden P. Bowne, whose philosophy is the prevailing one in our Methodist schools.*"*

"So far as ——— college is concerned, Dr. Athearn's statements are absolutely incorrect. Our college is making a very large and necessary contribution to the work of the church. Its influence in shaping the views and the purpose of students is wholly good. We have not, in many years, graduated a student who was not a professing Christian and nearly all of our graduates are active workers in the church. Pastors frequently say to me that their young people are more interested and active in the church work after they return from college than before they went away to school. . . . *While I have answered your question with reference especially to ——— College, I know that Dr. Athearn's accusation is unjust and his statements misleading with regard to most of our Presbyterian colleges. I do not, as a matter of fact, know of one to which they would apply.*"*

Of the eighty colleges denying the charges, twenty-four think the criticism in general "substantially correct" but protest it is not true of them. Some of these would modify his language to fit their thought, others take him at his word:

* Italics introduced by the Editor.

"I think that in the main his contention is right, although I would not put it so strong—to think that denominational colleges have failed. They have been greatly handicapped. . . . I think it is easy to underestimate the work they are doing, for in many cases the work is not done under a specific department. I have been making a study of the kind of teachers they have produced and I am sure they rank above the average, especially in the matter of biblical history and literature."

"I think the statement of Dr. Athearn is a little extreme. I will agree that in my judgment the denominational colleges have been timid. They have not stressed as much as they are entitled to do definite Christian teaching lest they be held prudish and peculiar, but I do think that their faculties have been selected with greater care, more consideration being given to positive Christian character than in the case of faculties assembled in state institutions, and in my judgment, this is much more vital than curriculum instruction."

"Whatever may be the manner of conducting the work in other schools, we feel that the criticism hardly applies to ————"

"I want to record my conviction that so far as ———— is concerned, our work is constructive and in the interests of religious faith. I think there is, however, if the whole college world is considered, something of truth in Dr. Athearn's statement that 'there have been lamentable failures in the Departments of Philosophy, Ethics and Sociology.'"

"I think there is too much truth in it. With natural and increasing dependence on relations to their alumni and high school as sources of financial support and students, both churches and colleges have tended to lose their earlier vital touch and reciprocal relationship. The churches need to seek a close friendly touch and to develop large financial helpfulness, so that colleges in their perplexity and straits can feel that they are not depending on a broken reed. . . . We have tried earnestly to promote and make more vital the religious relationships of our institution."

"I do not think that Dr. Athearn has overstated the case, if I understand him correctly. Except in a few cases I believe the church college has drifted considerably from the evangelical Christian viewpoint. In our own institution we stand firmly on the

absolute authority of the Bible as the inerrant Word of God. We do not teach Biblical Literature but the Bible as God's message to lost men. The Bible itself is, first of all, our text-book."

"The statement by Walter S. Athearn is very significant, and I believe on the whole, a just statement. We believe at _____ college we are making progress toward a significant answer to this statement."

"It is my conviction both from observation and experience that there is altogether too much truth in what he has said. The ideal of building character as the proper function of a college has been lost in the struggle to pile up endowment and build buildings. Only a few days ago a student in one of our most prominent denominational colleges expressed to me with great feeling his disappointment that at his college it was utterly impossible to maintain any Christian organization. He had no explanation to offer except that the students themselves were not interested. When I asked definitely if the college administration and faculty made any positive efforts to overcome the condition, he said, 'None that I have been able to find except in the case of two or three particular men.' My own college days are not so far past but that very vivid recollections remain and I shall have to be frank in saying although with almost a sense of shame that there was very little in the general college atmosphere and life to stimulate or cultivate a positive Christian interpretation of life.

"I should prefer to have some one else come into my own institution to formulate his judgments of conditions here. Still . . . there is an atmosphere of earnestness and sincere Christian influence. Many have asked me how we have succeeded in holding out against the present day tendency. My reply is that in our employment of faculty members we demand not only scholastic attainment but very definite and positive Christian character. We employ first a man, then a teacher."

"There is considerable truth in his assertions. Many of our Christian colleges are no longer Christian. The ideals which obtained fifty years ago have been supplanted by the ideals of our great state universities. Here we are making a very strenuous effort to put our college on a Christian basis. All Freshmen are compelled to study the Bible. Our students are all compelled to

go to chapel. Our professor of philosophy gives an interpretation of the ideals of Christianity."

"The expression "redeem the church college" is rather startling, and yet I believe there has been a certain justification for the expression. Church colleges have depended too largely upon an indefinite "spirit and atmosphere" and have done too little definite work. I think our own college has been somewhat ahead of many others for some years. We have a department which we call Christianity, in which two professors give their full time. We have one year of compulsory Bible study, one year of compulsory ethics, and advanced elective courses in both."

"It is my opinion that there is considerable measure of truth in Dr. Athearn's criticism. Of course, it applies to the colleges in varying degrees, and to some of them not at all. The college of which I am president belongs in this latter class. ————— aims to give its students broad horizons in its interpretation of truth to avoid enslavement to the letter that killeth. At the same time, it stands for the great fundamentals of the Christian faith. I believe, as did my friend the late President Hyde of Bowdoin College, that the college which is not Christian is no college at all."

Thirty Colleges Working Out the Problem

It is sometimes hard to draw the line; the colleges whose testimony has just been heard shade off almost imperceptibly into a group of thirty which frankly admit shortcomings both individually and as a class, but ask suspension of judgment while they continue their study of a situation of which they are keenly aware, which they deplore, and which they are earnestly striving to correct. Some of the most significant and hopeful reports are from this group. So fresh, so sincere and vital, so varied in their point of view are these expressions of opinion by some of the wisest of our college executives that it is a matter of regret that space forbids the printing of brief extracts from every letter. In the extracts which follow, it is hoped that a representative selection has been made and that no important point of view has been omitted.

"It scarcely seems to me fair to make such a sweeping statement as that contained in the address referred to for I doubt if the matter is so simple as to be covered by one generalization. On

the other hand I have the impression that the denominational colleges of the country probably fall into about three groups. In the first, I have no doubt that a species of scholasticism is still taught which bears no relation at all to the scientific and social problems of the day. At the opposite extreme there are probably church schools which have forgotten entirely the need of philosophical reconstruction along the lines of applied Christianity. Between these it is true there are without question a large number of colleges in which a definite attempt is being made to arrive at a sound Christian philosophy which takes account of both the scientific knowledge of the time and the social situation, with the attempt to arrive at a unified point of view which shall be in keeping with Christian idealism. ————— is numbered among this group."

"There is a considerable degree of truth in what he says; though the statement, of course, like all sweeping statements, makes the mistake of putting all the colleges in the same class in these matters, which is certainly not correct. With reference to our own situation, I have had these very questions of Dr. Athearn's in mind in all our appointments in these fields for years. The result is not equally satisfactory, of course, at every point, but I think we are reasonably attaining our goal."

"I think there is a good deal of truth in Dr. Athearn's statement concerning our colleges in general and I think ————— is very much like other colleges. I do not think the blame for the attitude of the students can be placed altogether upon college instructors. The home and the age, the church itself must all take their share. But we cannot escape our responsibility in the matter. I think some instructors think a neutral public attitude towards religion is the only thing that is fitting in a country like ours where all faiths and no faiths are represented. This point of view of course they get from our state universities. So far as Biblical Departments are concerned, I know of none that do not have instructors very much in earnest in helping students to get the Christian point of view. Yet there are always some who are more in earnest than others and the fact that the modern point of view is so different from the conservative results often in unfair criti-

cism and in some cases a *constructive* gospel is not guarded sufficiently.

"It is a difficult matter to make a Biblical Department stand for just what it ought. I am willing to take my share of the blame for the attitude of students in ————. But at the same time I think our Biblical Department should be known as trying as hard as possible to help students to a constructive truth. Our courses are so conducted that no one text-book is used in any course. I enclose a list of a few which we regard as especially helpful."

Some of the colleges resent the implications involved in the criticism of Dr. Athearn and fearlessly reply to a charge they think intolerant and bigoted, declaring loyalty to the truth as their sole and ultimate aim both in administration and teaching. They possess convictions which deserve to be heard. As one man puts it, they think "that there is some confusion as to whether a church college is primarily an educational institution or an instrument of the church which has among its other duties that of education."

"I would say briefly that Dr. A's assertions hardly have application in ———— college. The Christian point of view is always adequately represented in appropriate ways in philosophical, ethical and sociological work. Such courses would be one-sided if they did not have this characteristic. I think it fair to say, however, that Faculties in these departments are loyal to the demands of a truly scientific method, are concerned with all appropriate phases of their subjects and do not limit themselves to present distinct propaganda for only one point of view."

"In our defense I think the following remarks might be advanced:

"The immediate aim and desire of the professor of philosophy is to teach *philosophy*, not religion. His obligation is to introduce the student to the philosophic thought of the world as it has developed through the ages. His special hope is to create in the student a power of philosophic thinking, not to instill into his mind a definite set of ideas, religious or otherwise. He has religious convictions as other men and these may be prominent in his daily walk and conversation, but if he is a good teacher of philosophy he will respect independent thinking wherever he discovers it and finds it to have the ring of sincerity.

"In *psychology*, which is a science and therefore totally apart from religious implications, the teacher must impart a great body of facts. It is difficult to see how he can utilize this material to support Christian doctrine.

"The relation of *ethics* to religion is much closer; ethics is a science based on values rather than facts. Values can scarcely be other than personal, and they will vary among individuals. Here too, however, judicious discussion of various moral systems must be carried through. As soon as ethics becomes a form of propaganda for some type of theological opinion, it loses its aim and degenerates into a species of dogmatic exhortation.

"There is plenty of opportunity to inculcate Christian belief in the minds of the students of a Christian college. If this activity should absorb the time of the classes there would soon be no actual college instruction, no college in any real sense. The purpose of those who planned the institution to further both Christian belief and cultural education would thus be frustrated."

Perhaps, after all, the difference is more apparent than real and occasioned by variety in emphasis. If as one writer has said, "The college which is not Christian is no college at all," may not the converse be equally true that the Christianity that is not open-minded and loyal to the ever-extending horizons of truth is not itself conceived in the spirit of Him who said, "If my words abide in you, ye shall know the truth and *the truth* shall make you free."

Possibly all would agree with the correspondent who said:

"We assumed that the truth is the Christian teaching and endeavored to teach the truth as the best investigators presented it. We assume that Christianity does not have any especial patent upon truth. What is true is true and that is all there is about it, and there was no special pleading."

He adds,

"That this policy works seems to be evinced by a rather large percentage of students who planned to enter some form of special service for the church or missions."

The preacher is more important than the pulpit, the missionary than the mission house, and the teacher than the text-book. A large majority of the college presidents refer to this fact, and reference was omitted in the quotations only because it was so •

common. It surpasses all else in significance. We may well ponder this paragraph from the president of a college who says:

"We are sending graduates every year into fields of religious service, and one-fourth of our more than five hundred students last year indicated their intention to give themselves to forms of full-time Christian vocations. Attention is given to the students' religious life and it is rare for a person to be graduated who is not a Christian and church member."

"My judgment relative to many religious colleges is that they are failing to be religious in the requirements of personal conduct of professor and student, in the clear ideals and atmosphere of the institutions. There is a laxity in and shading off from the finer grace and quality which give strength and beauty to human character. They appear to forget that while they must be in the world they need not be of the world. Social practices and individual habits seem to discourage the better things and students are graduated who not only lack scholarship but who are coarse in tastes, without good manners and unpracticed in Christian fortitude. My criticism would be rather directed against the college personnel, from president to the humblest teacher. Let them exemplify Christianity by practicing it and the teaching will be of the right sort."

By inadvertence, the president of a state university received one of the letters of inquiry. He made the following courteous and suggestive reply:

"This matter has interested me very deeply, and I feel that our problem is to get men of deep spiritual point of view to teach these subjects. I think a good deal of the criticism that is cast upon the collegees is due to the ultra-conservatives misjudging what we are teaching. Anybody who is reading the modern stuff on philosophy, psychology, sociology, political science, or any other field, must be somewhat cognizant of the enormous strides ahead that are being made. Matters are being misconstrued by the ultra-conservatives which to anyone familiar with the trend of thought are not a menace or a necessary cause of worry. On the other hand, I think that there are a great many teachers in our colleges who have no interest in the spiritual end, or at least

they are ignoring that end, and are not thinking or working in it. Their influence is bad because it is not positively good."

While the character and personality of the teacher are recognized as of first importance, one reason for the request for a list of books found useful in the constructive presentation of the Christian point of view, was the belief that few college teachers of the subjects mentioned have had opportunity to work in a scholarly way the effective presentation of the newer developments in their field, so that a text-book is indispensable.

There were many general recommendations of "the works of So-and-So," but more than 700 individual titles were submitted, usually without comment. We print below from this unanalysed list, *not* as "approved," but as a result of our inquiry and a part of the picture, those books which are recommended by three or more institutions.

Requests for counsel and suggestions growing out of others experience in this direction were numerous and there is an opportunity here for further service. Criticism of the list given below by those competent to speak is invited.

Three colleges or more recommend the following books.

Bible, Biblical History and Literature

- BADE—*Old Testament in the Light of Today.*
- *BAILEY & KENT—*Evolution of the Hebrew Commonwealth.*
- *BROWN—*The Main Points.*
- BURTON—*The Records and Letters of the Apostolic Age.*
- *BURTON & MATTHEWS—*Constructive Studies in the Life of Christ.*
- CLARKE—*The Ideal of Jesus.*
- CLARKE—*An Outline of Christian Theology.*
- EISELEN—*Prophecy and the Prophets.*
- GLOVER—*The Jesus of History.*
- GLOVER—*Jesus in the Experience of Men.*
- GODSPEED—*The Story of the New Testament.*
- KENT—*Biblical Geography and History.*
- *KENT—*The Historical Bible* (4 vols).
- KENT—*The Life and Teachings of Jesus.*
- KENT—*Social Teachings of the Prophets and Jesus.*
- KENT—*Teaching and Work of the Apostles.*
- KNUDSON—*Beacon Lights of Prophecy.*
- *BLACKMAR & GILLEN—*Outlines of Sociology.*
- ROYCE—*The Spirit of Modern Philosophy.*

McGiffert—*History of Christianity in the Apostolic Age.*

Matthews—*History of New Testament Times.*

*Mathews—*The Social Teachings of Jesus.*

*Peritz—*Old Testament History.*

*Rall—*New Testament History.*

*Sanders—*The History of the Hebrews.*

Smith—*In the Days of His Flesh.*

Smith—*Old Testament History.*

Soares—*Social Ideals and Institutions of the Bible.*

Stalker—*The Life of Christ.*

*Stevens & Burton—*Harmony of the Gospels.*

Wild—*Evolution of the Hebrew People.*

Wood & Grant—*The Bible as Literature.*

Philosophy and Ethics; Philosophy of Religion.

*Brown—*The Christian Life.*

*Bowne—*Principles of Ethics.*

*Bowne—*Personalism.*

*Bowne—*Philosophy of Metaphysics.*

*Bowne—*Theism.*

Calkins—*The Good Man and the Good.*

Clarke—*The Christian Doctrine of God.*

Coe—*Psychology of Religion.*

Creighton—*Introduction to Logic.*

*Cushman—*History of Philosophy.*

*Dewey & Tufts—*Ethics.*

*Drake—*Problems of Conduct.*

*Everett—*Moral Values.*

Fairbairn—*The Philosophy of the Christian Religion.*

*Fisher—*The Grounds of Theistic and Christian Belief.*

Fletcher—*Introduction to Philosophy.*

*Galloway—*The Philosophy of Religion.*

Gregory—*Christian Ethics.*

*James—*Psychology.*

Jerusalem—*Introduction to Philosophy.*

King—*Rational Living.*

King—*Ethics of Jesus.*

King—*Fundamental Questions.*

Leighton—*The Field of Philosophy.*

Mackenzie—*A Manual of Ethics.*

Paulsen—*A System of Ethics.*

Pringle-Pattison—*The Idea of God.*

*Pratt—*The Religious Consciousness.*

Rashdall—*Philosophy and Religion.*

Rauschenbusch—*Christianity and the Social Crisis.*

*Rogers—*A Student's History of Philosophy.*

- SELLARS—*Essentials of Logic.*
 SETH—*A Study of Ethical Principles.*
 SORLEY—*On Moral Values and the Idea of God.*
 *THILLY—*History of Philosophy.*
 *WEBER—*History of Philosophy.*
 *WRIGHT—*Self-Realization.*
 WRIGHT—*A Student's Philosophy of Religion.*

Political Science.

- BRYCE—*The American Commonwealth.*
 *OGG—*Governments of Europe.*
 OGG & RAY—*Introduction to American Government.*
 WILLOUGHBY & ROGERS—*Introduction to Problems of Government.*

History and Development of Religion.

- BARTON—*The Religions of the World.*
 *BETTS—*How to Teach Religion.*
 COE—*A Social Theory of Religious Education.*
 *ELLWOOD—*The Reconstruction of Religion.*
 MENZIES—*The History of Religion.*
 MOORE—*The History of Religion.*
 *SOPER—*Religions of Mankind.*
 WALKER—*A History of the Christian Church.*

Sociology.

- COOLEY—*Social Organization.*
 *ELLWOOD—*Sociology and Modern Social Problems.*
 ELY—*Outlines of Economics.*
 GIDDINGS—*Principles of Sociology.*
 *GILLEN—*Poverty and Delinquency.*
 HAYES—*Introduction to the Study of Sociology.*
 HENDERSON—*Social Duties from a Christian Point of View.*
 MANGOLD—*Problems of Child Welfare.*
 PARK & BURGESS—*Introduction to the Science of Sociology.*
 RAUSCHENBUSCH—*Christianizing the Social Order.*
 RIIS—*How the Other Half Lives.*
 *ROSS—*Principles of Sociology.*
 WARNER—*American Charities.*

* Recommended by five or more colleges.